



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

422 (line 17 from bottom) For *it* read *is*.

449 (line 12 from bottom) For *heterogeny* read *heterogony*.

465 For *phallephoric* read *phallophoric*.

Finally, to conclude this list of little things, I note that 'will' and 'would' continually take the place of 'shall' and 'should.' cf. 68, 96, 114, 151, 192, 227, 241, 258, 267, 331, etc.

There are, however, larger things also to be considered; and of these there are two (as Wundt might say) that have specially impressed me. I suggest, first, that it would be well to give the full titles, dates, places of publication and (if these exist) titles and dates of translations, of the books which Wundt mentions casually and characterizes incompletely in the course of his exposition. Wundt's references, which naturally tend to be German, might also be supplemented by a few of our first-rate English books. A selected bibliography would surely be of great aid to the serious student; and if the publishers should object to an extension of the volume, there is a blank page 524 asking to be filled. I suggest, secondly, that in the cases where Wundt trips over a matter of fact—the generalization concerning Australian shields on p. 125 (cf. 299) is a flagrant instance—the translator should try to discover the source of the mistake, and in a footnote should state it and correct it by giving chapter and verse of some more reliable authority. It is impossible that a book of this sort should be errorless, but the errors lie on the surface.

E. B. T.

*The Biological Foundations of Belief.* By WESLEY RAYMOND WELLS. Boston, Richard C. Badger, 1921. pp. xi., 124.

The author has here brought together five essays, previously published in periodicals, which have as a common theme some aspect of religious belief. The first essay, which points out the "biological utility of religious belief during the course of human experience," gives instances and deductions from history which, if accepted, prove that the human races which have survived owe their survival as well as the institutions of art, industry, science, law and politics to the fact that they possessed some form of religious belief, quite independently of the question whether those beliefs were true or false. The argument leaves us a little uncertain whether belief is the foundation of biology or biology the foundation of belief. Religious belief, we infer, stands as the 'cause' of biological survival, although in a later essay the survival of belief points to its biological basis.

The second essay, which treats of two fallacies, the *pragmatic fallacy* and the *fallacy of false attribution*, is of a higher order and of more concern for the philosophy and psychology of religion. The first of these fallacies is the fallacy of assuming to be true that which carries value or that which works; it is due to the failure to recognize that beliefs which are false may at the same time be of great value. A 'metaphysical' belief, whether true or false, has the same subjective effect or value; if it be a 'scientific' belief and untrue, the objective results will, if one persists in the belief and acts thereon, more than outweigh the subjective, and hence leave a balance on the side of disvalue. No attempt is made to apply in detail this mode of characterizing science.

If the discussion of the *pragmatic fallacy* leads on to questions of the relation of mind and body and perhaps inevitably to an organismic or behavioristic point of view, the *fallacy of false attribution* points to the problem of meaning on the one hand and of adequate stimuli on the other. The meaning which attaches to an experience is neither the experience itself nor the adequate stimulus for the experience, and the attribution of the experience to a supernatural source simply because the experience carries a meaning which points to the supernatural, even in the face of an adequate

physiological explanation, is the common error of mysticism. The mystic steadfastly refuses to define God as the mystical experience; He is "not the experience but the giver of the experience." As the author rightly insists, the experience as experience is a fact wholly independent of what the experience means. The full comprehension and avoidance of these two errors should clear up much confusion and obviate common errors in metaphysical thought; not, again, that 'metaphysical' beliefs must be true to have value or to survive; on the contrary, their value and survival power are independent of their truth or falsity.

We may, as we saw above, differentiate 'scientific' and 'metaphysical' beliefs since the one does and the other does not have objective effects. In a similar manner we may differentiate religious values from those of the other value-disciplines on the basis of "the objects to which they are said to attach." Having thus isolated religious values the author offers a classification of them "which will make clearer what would be an objective, behavioristic account of religious values." It is a classification logically developed and concretely applied.

But beliefs are modes of response or organic attitudes, either positive or negative and, although truth does not, properly speaking, attach to beliefs, but only to propositions, we may call a belief true or false when the response accords with the truth or falsity of the proposition responded to. Add to this the further statement that the instinctive-emotional nature of man determines the response, and you have one of the primary bases for the biological foundation of belief. The instincts, however, singly or in integrated complexes, pure or defiled by accumulations from experience (if they are anything other than the objective responses) are not religion: religion requires in addition "a belief as to the reality of some more or less supernatural object or objects about which these instincts are united into a religious complex." We thought that "belief consists either of an actual response or of an organic attitude." Here is surely definition from two different points of view. The author proceeds: "But, without such instincts as *driving forces* (italics ours) in human life, religious belief would not exist among men." What, then, is an instinct? and what is a belief? We are not greatly helped by the statement that "so far as questions of positivity and negativity in the behavioristic sense, and truth and falsity in the logical sense are concerned, belief and judgment are practically interchangeable."

The second argument in favor of a biological foundation of belief is the survival value, the almost universality, the permanency through change, the self-evident nature of certain beliefs. This could be, so the argument goes, only on the hypothesis of a biological foundation. The adoption of the behavioristic point of view makes such an evolutionary basis defensible.

The concluding essay presents in general outline the principles which should obtain in religious and moral education. The system rests almost entirely on the doctrines of recapitulation and of sublimation, although the latter doctrine supposes the former as a basis.

L. B. HOISINGTON

*Psychology for Normal Schools.* By L. A. AVERILL. New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1921. Pp. xx, 362. \$2.25.

In this book the prospective teacher is told what instinctive behavior is natural to the child, and what emotions are when emotion is regarded as a phase of instinctive behavior. Sensation, perception, attention, memory, imagination, thought are all presented as activities or as reactions to external stimuli. The reader is encouraged to look for manifestations of these activities in the child, and instances of their normal occurrence are cited. So